

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 16, 2004. Claims 5, 9-10, 17, 21-23, 31, and 40-42 remain pending in this application. Claims 5, 17, 31, and 40 are the independent claims.

In response to the objections to Claims 7-10, 12, 19-23, 30, 32-35, and 39, Applicant respectfully believes the amendments to and/or cancellation of Claims 7-10, 12, 19-23, 30, 32-35, and 39 adequately respond to the objection and requests its withdrawal.

On the merits, the Office Action rejected Claims 11, 24, 26, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully believes the cancellation of Claims 11, 24, 26, and 28 renders the rejection moot and requests its withdrawal.

Further on the merits, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-6, 11, 13-18, 24-29, 31, and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Reed et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,707; hereinafter "Reed"). Applicants respectfully traverse the § 102(e) rejection for at least the following reasons:


Reed fails to recite or suggest the steps of determining the location of a separately housed, second device located near to the first device; sending a request from the first device to the second

device that the second device provide its location to the first device; providing the location of the second device to the first device; and using the location of the second device as an estimate of the location of the first device. Rather, Reed recites transmitting a location estimate from a first device to a second device, calculating some confidence level in the second device, comparing it to a location estimate and confidence level in the second device, and determining whether to update the second device's location estimate. Reed does not use the location of the second device to estimate the location of the first device. Rather, it uses the location estimate of the first device to enhance or update the independently-generated location estimate of the second device. Thus the rejections of independent Claims 5 and 17 are respectfully traversed and Claims 5, and 17 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 9-10 and 21-23 depend from one or another of the independent Claims discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons. In addition, Applicant believes Claims 9-10 and 21-23, to be independently patentable and request separate consideration of each claim.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application. Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached by telephone at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Aaron Waxler
Reg. 48,027
(914) 333-9608
September 14, 2004

This Page is Inserted by IIFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IIFW Image Problem Mailbox.